



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,442	03/21/2002	Marcel Garnier	Garnier-3	3607
28581 7590 11/26/2003 DUANE MORRIS LLP 100 COLLEGE ROAD WEST, SUITE 100 PRINCETON, NJ 08540-6604			EXAMINER KERNS, KEVIN P	
			ART UNIT 1725	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/980,442

Applicant(s)

GARNIER ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin P. Kerns

Art Unit

1725

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.


Claim(s) rejected: 1-8.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicants' remarks/arguments remain unpersuasive in view of paragraphs 5, 9, and 11 of the final rejection (paper #10) mailed August 29, 2003. With regard to the applicants' remarks/arguments addressing the rejections of claims 5-7 under 35 USC 102(b) on pages 6-8 of the applicants' remarks, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants' arguments, as the structural limitations are disclosed and/or inherently set forth in Figures 3, 5, and 6 of Kubota et al., in paragraph 5 of the final rejection, and in the applicants' admitted prior art (in reference to Kubota et al.). As a result, all structural limitations cited in apparatus claims 5-7 exist, and these claims would remain rejected under 35 USC 102(b). With regard to the applicants' remarks/arguments addressing the rejections of claims 1-4 and 8 under 35 USC 103(a) on pages 8-12 of the applicants' remarks, the examiner respectfully asserts that the teachings of Eriksson et al. remedy the deficiencies of Kubota et al., as metal flow is indeed controlled in the continuous casting process via controlling one or more of the amperage and voltage of electromagnets (constant power source) to avoid unsymmetrical or unbalanced overall flow (see paragraph 9 of the final rejection). Furthermore, all variables of the claimed equations can inherently be measured and/or controlled. As a result, claims 1-4 and 8 would remain rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al. in view of Eriksson et al.

Continuation of 10. Other: acknowledgement of substitute specification and abstract on a separate sheet.



M. J. ANDERSON, Esq.
PRIMARY EXAMINER